



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,895	11/30/2001	Joan C. Teng	21756-013000	4164
51206	7590	01/18/2007	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER 8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/18/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/998,895	TENG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Amelia Rutledge	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11,13-21,23-31,33-36 and 39-43 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-11,13-21,23-31,33-36 and 39-43 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 10/19/2006; Request for Continued Examination, filed 10/19/2006.
2. Claims 1-11, 13-21, 23-31, 33-36, and 39-43 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 14, 24 and 39 are independent claims.
3. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks p. 11-12, filed 10/19/2006, with respect to the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims 1-11, 13, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. 101 have been withdrawn. Applicant's amendments to claims 14-21, 23-31, and 33, overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 and those rejections have been withdrawn.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

4. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/19/2006 has been entered.
5. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE**

FINAL even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).
Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. **Claims 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *SiteMinder Policy Server Operations Guide, Version 4.0* (hereinafter “SiteMinder”), Netegrity Inc., published 1997 and submitted with Applicant’s Information Disclosure Statement filed March 15, 2004.**

Regarding independent claim 39, SiteMinder teaches a policy server, i.e., identity system, for associating workflows, i.e., rules for user interaction with system resources, with policy domains (p. 235-237) by using SiteMinder responses and response groups (Chapter 11, p. 302-304) and creating policies, i.e., workflows, to specify actions that should take place when users access specific resources, which are tasks and/or software within a domain (Chapter 12, Policies, p. 325-328). Specifically, SiteMinder teaches that a policy domain is a logical grouping of resources associated with one or more user directories, i.e., one or more users of the system (p. 235, par. 1; p. 235). SiteMinder teaches that each user of the system has an associated identity

profile (p. 396-403, especially p. 396-397; p. 419-424; p. 431-435), compare to *associating workflows with one or more groups in an identity system, each group including one or more users of the identity system and each user of the identity system having an associated identity profile*. SiteMinder teaches *receiving a request to perform a task that pertains to a target identity profile in the identity system, wherein the request includes an identification of the target identity profile; identifying a set of one or more workflows that perform the task and are associated with groups that include the user associated with the target identity profile; and reporting the set of one or more workflows*; since SiteMinder teaches that policies, or workflows, contain rules, specified users or groups of users, responses, i.e., the action that is triggered in the workflow, and which have bindings to link a user with a policy (p. 326-328, also see Ch. 12, Policies). SiteMinder teaches *receiving a user selection of a first workflow from the set of one or more workflows; and performing one or more steps of said first workflow to affect the target identity profile*, because SiteMinder teaches that each user of the system has an associated identity profile, and that the system may be configured with a policy for user self-registration, i.e., a workflow, which contains steps for users to modify their own profiles (p. 398; p. 419-435), including deleting and modifying their own profiles.

Regarding dependent claims 40-43, SiteMinder teaches that each user of the system has an associated identity profile, and that the system may be configured with a policy for user self-registration, i.e., a workflow, which contains steps for users to modify

their own profiles (p. 398; p. 419-435), including deleting and modifying their own profiles.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-11, 13-21, 23-31, and 33-36, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Du et al. (hereinafter “Du”), U.S. Patent No. 6,041,306, issued March 2000, in view of SiteMinder.**

Independent claim 1 cites: *A computer-implemented method for using workflows, comprising the steps of: associating workflows with one or more groups in an identity system, each group including one or more users of the identity system; receiving a request to perform a task that pertains to at least one identity profile of an entity in said identity system; and performing a first workflow for said task, said first workflow is associated with a first group that includes a target identity profile of said request;*

Du teaches a method for performing flexible workflow process execution in a distributed workflow management system (Abstract), and encapsulating legacy systems using business objects as a representation of something active in the business domain, to map between the business model and the operational procedures of the workflow

process system (Col. 8, l. 36-44; l. 52-64). Du teaches launching workflow process instances in response to user requests (Col. 7, l. 45-46). Du teaches that a policy is a set of rules that determines how resources, i.e., users, are related to tasks (Col. 8, l. 52-63). Although Du teaches applying policies to users, Du does not explicitly teach associating workflows with groups in an identity system. However, SiteMinder teaches a policy server, i.e., identity system, for associating workflows, i.e., rules for user interaction with system resources, with policy domains (p. 235-237) by using SiteMinder responses and response groups (Chapter 11, p. 302-304) and creating policies, i.e., workflows, to specify actions that should take place when users access specific resources, which are tasks and/or software within a domain (Chapter 12, Policies, p. 325-328), compare to *associating workflows with one or more groups in an identity system, each group including one or more users of the identity system*. Specifically, SiteMinder teaches that a policy domain is a logical grouping of resources associated with one or more user directories, i.e., one or more users of the system (p. 235, par. 1; p. 235).

Claim 1 also cites: *wherein; said first workflow comprises a predefined set of steps that perform said tasks to affect the target identity profile, said predefined set of steps comprising a first step and a second step;*
said first step is performed by a first program;
said second step is performed by a second program;
information is passed between said first program and said second program according to a defined set of rules: and

at least one of the first program and the second program is external to the workflow.

Du teaches creating workflow processes by assembling business objects in sequence, i.e., *comprises a predefined set of steps that perform said tasks*, and applying a set of rules for passing information between programs, and executing the flexible workflow processes as specified by a directed graph comprising a set of nodes connected by arcs (Col. 8, l. 45-63; Col. 11, l. 26-Col. 12, l. 29). Du teaches resource mapping in flexible workflow paths that also support redirect resource mapping, which allows a business object to recommend another business object for a task (Col. 17, l. 25-40), compare to *information is passed between said first program and said second program according to a defined set of rules: and at least one of the first program and the second program is external to the workflow*. The flexible workflow execution allows freedom of task assignment and external activities to be performed (Col. 12, l. 41-43; Col. 6, l. 39-49).

Both Du and SiteMinder are analogous art, since both are directed toward policy and identity management. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply SiteMinder to Du, so that Du would have the benefit of a policy server which would integrate applications and improve workflow by integrating directories and external databases in its policies so that legacy applications and systems could still be used (SiteMinder, p. 22-23, last paragraph).

Regarding dependent claim 2, while Du does not explicitly teach associating a workflow with a hierarchical data structure, SiteMinder teaches creating a policy domain which contains zero or more realms (p. 241, "Creating a Realm"). SiteMinder teaches that realms represent groups of resources and realms can be nested within other realms to represent the grouping of network resources (p. 247-249, "Understanding Nested Realms"). Both Du and SiteMinder are analogous art, since both are directed toward policy management. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply SiteMinder to Du, so that Du would have the benefit of a policy server which would integrate applications and improve workflow by integrating directories and external databases in its policies so that legacy applications and systems could still be used (SiteMinder, p. 22-23, last paragraph).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Du teaches identifying one or more workflows associated with a target identity profile (Col. 5, l. 59-Col. 6, l. 10). SiteMinder teaches associating resources with a policy domain (p. 235-236). Both Du and SiteMinder are analogous art, since both are directed toward policy management. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply SiteMinder to Du, so that Du would have the benefit of a policy server which would integrate applications and improve workflow by integrating directories and external databases in its policies so that legacy applications and systems could still be used (SiteMinder, p. 22-23, last paragraph).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Du teaches that in flexible workflow process execution multiple workflows can be created and/or adapted to a user request, and that a user can identify a target identity profile of another user, thereby altering the workflow and a new workflow or set of workflows may be created to perform the task (Col. 19, l. 54-67).

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 6, Du teaches that the user can request to delete or modify a target identity profile, for example the role specification and activity to a business object (Col. 19, l. 54-67). In another example, the user can request to add or drop communication paths between certain endpoints in a private virtual network (Col. 10, l. 40-45).

Regarding dependent claims 7 and 8, Du teaches the steps of identifying a set of one more workflows that perform a task and are associated with domains that include the target, and reporting one more workflow, and receiving from a user a selection of the first workflow, and performing one or more steps of said first workflow, in the prototype of automatically configuring a data path with a flexible workflow (Fig. 6, Col. 10, l. 5-Col. 11, l. 25). SiteMinder teaches a policy server, i.e., identity system, for associating workflows, i.e., rules for user interaction with system resources, with policy domains (p. 235-237) by using SiteMinder responses and response groups (Chapter 11, p. 302-304) and creating policies to specify actions that should take place when users access specific resources, which are tasks and/or software within a domain (Chapter

12, Policies, p. 325-328). Both Du and SiteMinder are analogous art, since both are directed toward policy and identity management. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply SiteMinder to Du, so that Du would have the benefit of a policy server which would integrate applications and improve workflow by integrating directories and external databases in its policies so that legacy applications and systems could still be used (SiteMinder, p. 22-23, last paragraph).

Regarding dependent claims 9 and 10, Du teaches the use of policies to ensure proper authorization and authentication (Col. 8, l. 57-63), but Du does not explicitly teach an integrated identity and access system. However, SiteMinder comprises an integrated identity and access system (p. 20-24, "Overview") with user self-registration (p. 395, par. 2). Both Du and SiteMinder are analogous art, since both are directed toward policy management. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply SiteMinder to Du, so that Du would have the benefit of a policy server which would integrate applications and improve workflow by integrating directories and external databases in its policies so that legacy applications and systems could still be used (SiteMinder, p. 22-23, last paragraph).

Regarding dependent claim 11, Du teaches that workflows can delegate work to other workflow processes or resources (Col. 20, l. 50-Col. 21, l. 15).

Regarding dependent claim 13, while Du does not explicitly teach associating a workflow with a hierarchical data structure, SiteMinder teaches creating a policy domain which contains zero or more realms (p. 241, "Creating a Realm"). SiteMinder teaches that realms represent groups of resources and realms can be nested within other realms to represent the grouping of network resources (p. 247-249, "Understanding Nested Realms"). SiteMinder teaches that the hierarchical data structure of policy domains and realms includes an LDAP directory (p. 352). Both Du and SiteMinder are analogous art, since both are directed toward policy management. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply SiteMinder to Du, so that Du would have the benefit of a policy server which would integrate applications and improve workflow by integrating directories and external databases in its policies so that legacy applications and systems could still be used (SiteMinder, p. 22-23, last paragraph).

In regard to independent claim 14, claim 14 reflects the processor readable storage device(s) having processor readable code used to perform the method as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 15-21 and 23, claims 15-21 and 23 reflect the processor readable storage device(s) having processor readable code used to perform the method as claimed in claims 2, 3, 4, 7-9, 11, and 13, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 24, claim 24 reflects the apparatus used to perform the method as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 25-33, claims 25-31 and 33 reflect the apparatus used to perform the method as claimed in claims 2, 3, 4, 7-9, 11, and 13, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claims 34 and 35, while Du teaches a flexible workflow process execution system, Du does not explicitly teach managing a target identity profile. However, SiteMinder teaches automatically managing target user identity profiles using workflows, i.e., specifying templates and sequences for registration (p. 398-399; p. 398-401). SiteMinder teaches applying domain policies to users (p. 141-416), i.e., changing a user attribute. Both Du and SiteMinder are analogous art, since both are directed toward policy management. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply SiteMinder to Du, so that Du would have the benefit of a policy server which would integrate applications and improve workflow by integrating directories and external databases in its policies so that legacy applications and systems could still be used (SiteMinder, p. 22-23, last paragraph).

Regarding dependent claim 36, while Du does not explicitly teach managing certificates, SiteMinder teaches managing certificates associated with identity profiles (p. 533-536) via the user's browser. Both Du and SiteMinder are analogous art, since both are directed toward policy management. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply SiteMinder to Du, so that Du would have the benefit of a policy server which would integrate applications and improve workflow by integrating directories and external databases in its policies so that legacy applications and systems could still be used (SiteMinder, p. 22-23, last paragraph).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/19/2006 in regard to the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections, Du in view of SiteMinder (Remarks, p. 12-16), have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the Du and SiteMinder references do not teach the limitations of newly added claims 39-43. However, SiteMinder teaches a policy server, i.e., identity system, for associating workflows, i.e., rules for user interaction with system resources, with policy domains (p. 235-237) by using SiteMinder responses and response groups (Chapter 11, p. 302-304) and creating policies, which are functionally equivalent to workflows to specify actions that should take place when users access specific resources, which are tasks and/or software within a domain (Chapter 12, Policies, p. 325-328).

4. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by

combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both Du and SiteMinder are analogous art, since both are directed toward policy management. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply SiteMinder to Du, so that Du would have the benefit of a policy server which would integrate applications and improve workflow by integrating directories and external databases in its policies so that legacy applications and systems could still be used (SiteMinder, p. 22-23, last paragraph).

5. While applicant argues that SiteMinder discloses policies to control user access to resources, rather than workflows (Remarks, p. 14), it is the examiner's opinion that the policies disclosed by SiteMinder are functionally and programmatically equivalent to the claimed workflows, because SiteMinder teaches that policies, or workflows, contain rules, specified users or groups of users, responses, i.e., the action that is triggered in the workflow, and which have bindings to link a user with a policy (p. 326-328, also see Ch. 12, Policies). Further, in regard to claims 1-11, 13-21, 23-31, and 33-36, Du is relied upon to teach launching workflow process instances in response to user requests (Col. 7, l. 45-46). Du teaches that a policy is a set of rules that determines how resources, i.e., users, are related to tasks (Col. 8, l. 52-63). Therefore it appears that

applicant's arguments are based on a piecemeal analysis of the references rather than the combination of references as a whole.

Conclusion

7. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amelia Rutledge whose telephone number is 571-272-7508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AR



Doug Mutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100